

REMARKS

The Applicant amends the specification to cancel claim 3 and to amend claims 1, 4, 35, 63, and 70. The amendment introduces no new matter. After the amendment, claims 1 and 4-74 are pending in the application.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-74 as either anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102 by U.S. Patent No. 5,883,553 to Tsumura (“Tsumura”); or obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over the combination of Tsumura and at least one of U.S. Patent No. 5,170,500 to Broderick (“Broderick”), U.S. Patent No. 5,195,045 to Keane et al. (“Keane”), and U.S. Patent No. 6,177,872 to Kodulkula et al. (“Kodulkula”). For at least the reasons articulated below in detail, the Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action fails to set forth a *prima facie* anticipation rejection of the claims.

At the outset, the Office Action does not appear to address the differential input and/or differential output limitations that appear in the independent claims and, by implication, in the dependent claims as well. Put another way, the Office Action does not set forth how any of the references teaches the differential input and/or differential output limitation. To the Applicant’s understanding, none of the references teaches the limitations. Thus, the references fail to anticipate or render obvious the claimed subject matter.

Furthermore, the Applicant has amended claims 1, 35, and 63, as appropriate, to more particularly point out and distinctly claim a feature of the invention. More particularly, the claimed “filter” receives a radio-frequency input signal, and provides a radio-frequency output signal. The Applicant notes that Tsumura does not teach operating on a radio-frequency input signal to generate a radio-frequency output signal; rather, Tsumura discloses frequency converters. For at least that reason, Tsumura fails to support a proper anticipation rejection of claims 1, 35-37, and 63-65.

Because of at least the above reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that the presently pending claims are allowable. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests a prompt Notice of Allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in allowable condition. Consequently, favorable reconsideration and prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. No fee (other than for the extension of time) is believed to be due. Should any fees under 37 CFR 1.16-1.21 be required for any reason relating to the enclosed materials, however, the Commissioner is authorized to deduct such fees from Deposit Account No. 10-1205/SILA:107.

The examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the phone number indicated below with any questions or comments, or to otherwise facilitate expeditious and compact prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'MR Peterson', written over a horizontal line.

MAXIMILIAN R. PETERSON
Registration No. 46,469
Attorney for Applicant

O'KEEFE, EGAN & PETERMAN
1101 Capital of Texas Highway South
Building C, Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78746
(512) 347-1611
FAX: (512) 347-1615